

CHAPTER 1 – ANATOLI GOLITSYN--A Conspiratorial Dilemma

As students of conspiracy arguments know, the John Birch Society is quite fond of citing Soviet defector Anatoli Golitsyn's assertions to substantiate JBS arguments about successful Soviet deception operations against the United States and the western world. In fact, the JBS recommends and sells both of Golitsyn's books.

There is, however, a major dilemma contained within JBS arguments which accept Golitsyn's assertions.

Let's review some background information about what Golitsyn told western intelligence agencies after his defection. The following numbered excerpts in blue font come from Edward Jay Epstein's website (link below).

My comments, in black, appear underneath each excerpt. Epstein authored the 1989 book, *Deception: The Invisible War Between the KGB and the CIA*

<http://www.edwardjayepstein.com/archived/looking2.htm>

(1) KGB RE-ORGANIZATION IN 1959 -- based upon Golitsyn's explanation.

"Angleton wanted to know more about the Soviet apparatus for deception. Why had the KGB moved from being espionage to deception? Why had it been re-organized? Golitsyn suggested that it all began with a Politburo assessment in the mid 1950s that the Soviet Union would be unlikely to prevail in a nuclear war. It followed that if it was to win against the West, it would be by fraud rather than force. For this singular purpose, Soviet intelligence would have to undertake the tricky job of manipulating the information western leaders received."

But given JBS premises, why would the Soviet leadership (and its intelligence assets) perceive a need to "manipulate" information that western leaders received during the 1950's and 1960's?

According to the Birch Society paradigm, as explained by Robert Welch in his "private letter" entitled **The Politician** and elsewhere, the United States, Great Britain, France, and Germany and most NATO countries were already being led by Communist agents and sympathizers and the major institutions of western countries were dominated and controlled by equally disloyal individuals. [For example: Robert Welch explicitly described U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower and French President Charles DeGaulle as "Communist agents" – knowingly taking orders from their "Communist superiors".]

Let's briefly review some pertinent Welch comments and then ask an obvious question:

The first edition of the "Scoreboard" issue of *American Opinion* magazine (edited by JBS founder Robert Welch), was designed to estimate **"the present degree of Communist influence or control over the economic and political affairs of almost all the nations of the world"**

The following are the pertinent "scores" of NATO countries:

Belgium (20-40%), Britain (20-40%), Canada (20-40%), Denmark (20-40%), France (40-60%), Greece (40-60%), Iceland (80-100%), Italy (40-60%), Luxembourg (20-40%), Netherlands (0-20%), Norway (40-60%), Portugal (0-20%), Turkey (0-20%), United States (20-40%), West Germany (0-20%). [*American Opinion*, July/August 1958, pages 22-23.]

Lest the reader think that a 20-40% score represents insignificant “*Communist influence and control*” --- please consider the following:

On page 279 of the original version of *The Politician*, which was written and circulated during the period from 1954 thru 1960, Welch discussed the 3 stages by which Communists came to control the U.S. Presidency.

In stages 1 and 2, FDR and Truman were “*used*” by the Communists. In Truman's case, according to Welch, he was used “*with his knowledge and acquiescence, as the price he consciously paid for their making him President.*”

Then Welch discusses the “3rd stage”:

“In the third stage, in my own firm opinion, the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency. For this third man, Eisenhower, there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. That word is treason.” [The Politician, unpublished version, page 268.]

If that wording is not explicit enough, here is another formulation by Welch from page 266. I have used CAPS on one portion for emphasis.

“For the sake of honesty, however, I want to confess here my own conviction that Eisenhower's motivation is more ideological than opportunistic. Or, to put it bluntly, I PERSONALLY THINK THAT HE HAS BEEN SYMPATHETIC TO ULTIMATE COMMUNIST AIMS, REALISTICALLY WILLING TO USE COMMUNIST MEANS TO HELP THEM ACHIEVE THEIR GOALS, KNOWINGLY ACCEPTING AND ABIDING BY COMMUNIST ORDERS, AND CONSCIOUSLY SERVING THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY FOR ALL OF HIS ADULT LIFE.”

During this period, Robert Welch also believed that the U.S. State Department, Defense Department, our CIA, and the U.S. Supreme Court were controlled and run by Communist agents or sympathizers.

In private remarks to the first meeting of his JBS National Council on January 9, 1960, at the Union League Club in Chicago, Welch made these observations about the gravity of our situation:

“From a careful and realistic study of the mountainous pile of evidence that is there for all to see, certain terrifying conclusions are objectively inescapable. Among them are:

- (1) The Communists are winning their large victories, as they always have, through the cumulative effect of small gains;*
- (2) They make these gains chiefly through the conniving assistance of many of the very diplomats and officials who are supposed to be opposing them;*
- (3) Communist influences are now in almost complete working control of our government;*
- (4) And hence, the United States Government is today, as it has been for many years, the most important and powerful single force promoting the world-wide Communist advance.”*

[A Confidential Report To Members Of The COUNCIL of The John Birch Society – minutes of 1/9/60 meeting held at Union League Club in Chicago IL, page 1-2; minutes signed by Robert Welch.]

Furthermore, according to Welch:

“Today, gentlemen, I can assure you, without the slightest doubt in my own mind, that the takeover at the top is, for all practical purposes, virtually complete. Whether you like it or not, or whether you believe it or not, our Federal Government is already, literally in the hands of the Communists.” [Ibid, page 2]

“In our two states with the largest population, New York and California...already the two present governors are almost certainly actual Communists.” [Ibid, page 7; this refers to Governors Edmund Brown of California and Nelson Rockefeller of New York]

“Our Supreme Court, dominated by Earl Warren and Felix Frankfurter and Hugo Black, is so visibly pro-Communist that no argument is even needed....And our federal courts below that level...are in many cases just as bad.” [Ibid, page 8]

"Our State Department is loaded with Communists from top to bottom, to the extent that our roll call of Ambassadors almost sounds like a list somebody has put together to start a Communist front." ... [Ibid, page 8]

"Our Central Intelligence Agency under Allen Dulles is nothing more or less than an agency to promote Communism throughout the world...Almost all the other Departments are loaded with Communists and Communist sympathizers. And this generalization most specifically does include our whole Defense Department." [Ibid, page 8]

Bottom-Line question:

Given this grave state of affairs, why would the Soviets need to engage in any sort of disinformation or deception campaigns? Why would they even need KGB operatives in the U.S. or other western countries?

Everything Communist leaders (a) needed to know or (b) wanted done, could presumably (in the Birch Society scheme of things) have been quickly and easily accomplished merely by picking up a telephone and calling their "agents" and "sympathizers" who already were in the supreme positions of power within western countries---RIGHT?

(2) "Conspirators" and the "Jewish" question.

The following passages from Epstein's book are relevant to comments routinely made by some conspiracy believers. I underline several sentences for emphasis.

"Under Shelepin, during this reorganization, Golitsyn worked on an analysis intended to demonstrate how conventional spying could be subordinated to deception goals, without potentially compromising the secrecy of the latter. The intrinsic problem was that KGB officers had to be in contact with western intelligence officers either to recruit them or to pass them disinformation, and, this presented the opportunity to defect or otherwise be compromised.

In fact, scores of Soviet intelligence officers had either defected or offered information to the CIA since the end of the war. While some of these sources could be assumed to be dispatched defectors from the KGB, a large number of the others turned out to be legitimate. How could the KGB sustain deceptions-- if it was probable that some of its officers would defect or otherwise betray its secret.

Golitsyn explained that the KGB re-organization in 1958-9 was designed to avoid this vulnerability. It effectively separated the KGB into two distinct entities. An outer and inner KGB.

The "**outer**" KGB was made up of personnel who, out of necessity, had to be in contact with foreigners, and were therefore vulnerable to being compromised. It included KGB recruiters and spotters posted to embassies and missions ,military attaches, disinformation and propaganda agents and illegal case officers who worked

abroad. Since they had to be in touch with Westerners, if only to attempt to recruit them as spies, they were assumed to be "doomed spies". A certain percentage would, by the law of probability would be caught. These "doomed spies" were the equivalent of pilots sent on raids over enemy territory. They were not only restricted from knowing any state secrets (other than what was necessary for their mission), but they were purposefully briefed on what it was useful for the enemy to learn if they were captured.

The "**inner**" KGB was the real repository of secrets. It was limited to a small number of trusted officers, under the direct supervision of the Politburo, who planned, orchestrated, controlled and analyzed the operations. (According to Golitsyn, all potential security risks, which included most of the officers of Jewish descent, were transferred into the outer service in preparation for the reorganization).

A "China wall" existed between these two levels. No personnel from the outer service would ever be transferred to the inner service, or vice versa. Nor would any personnel in the outer service ever be exposed to strategic secrets other than what had been prepared for them to divulge as disinformation."

1. How come there are not "**scores**" of defectors from the "CFR/New World Order conspiracy" which many conspiracy believers allege has been operating for decades? **What is different about the current alleged "CFR/NWO conspiracy" i.e. how is it organized and operated differently to permanently preclude defectors and disillusioned members?**

2. Why were "**officers of Jewish descent**" considered "**potential security risks**" if, as some conspiracy adherents insist, Jews were the primary movers and shakers within the Soviet system and Jews controlled the Bolshevik Revolution from its inception?

CHAPTER 2 – ANATOLI GOLITSYN---A Conspiratorial Dilemma

Back in March 2006, I posted a message in Albionic (the Yahoo conspiracy discussion group) to illustrate how conspiracy believers often propose the logically absurd idea that we can and should simultaneously believe two mutually exclusive propositions --- and **THAT** then is declared to be logical and rational analysis!

Unless and until conspiracy believers can identify and explain the methodology which they propose should be operative for resolution of contradictory data, there is no reason to accept their epistemological claim that conspiracy theories are actually genuine theories or "paradigms" deserving of serious consideration.

Thus, the fundamental question still remains: **How do conspiracy believers go about deciding whom and what to believe when two different sources (both of whom they describe as knowledgeable, authoritative, and reliable) come to different mutually exclusive conclusions about the same subject matter?**

Let us now turn our attention to another example of how this irrationality operates within conspiracy circles.

Once again, let's use Anatoli Golitsyn but in conjunction with another defector whose testimony is recommended by conspiracy believers, i.e. Michal Goleniewski.

For an introduction to the purported reliability of Michal Goleniewski, see the following right-wing sources:

- March 23, 1964 issue of *Dan Smoot Report*, for an article entitled "*Communist Spies in the State Department*".

- February 11, 1966 issue of *The Herald of Freedom* (published by Frank A. Capell) for article entitled “*The Strange Case of ‘Col. Goleniewski’*”
- April 1974 issue of Frank Capell’s *Confidential Intelligence Report of The Herald of Freedom*, for article entitled “*Henry Kissinger Named As Soviet Agent*”
- March 28, 1977 issue of Liberty Lobby’s publication, *The Spotlight*, for article entitled “*Refugee’s Petition to President Carter*”

Furthermore, on March 23, 1973, Goleniewski met with Robert Welch and he was invited by Welch to be a speaker at the Birch Society’s September 1973 National Council Dinner in New York City.

To give readers a sense of what the articles listed above convey, I am going to quote extensively from the 2/11/66 article by Frank Capell. Capell repeated this information in the Birch Society’s bi-weekly news magazine, Review of the News.

After the 9 excerpts quoted below, I will then introduce the data which Birchers (and their allies) never bother to mention.

- (1) “Evidence exists to prove that the individual known as Michal Goleniewski is Aleksei Nicholaevich Romanoff, born at Peterhof, Russia August 12, 1904, the son of Czar Nicholas II. Confidential records of the CIA would confirm this is if made public.”
- (2) “In 1924, for security reasons, the Czar changed his name to Michal Goleniewski...In 1930 Aleksei was taken into the Imperial All Russians Anti-Bolshevik Underground which had been established by his father and from then on he worked continuously as a secret underground member of this anti-communist force...”
- (3) “Aleksei entered the Polish Army in 1945 as part of his anti-communist work and in 1948 was assigned to Polish Army Counterintelligence. He held posts in the technical and scientific branches and also in the analysis and inspection sections of Polish Counterintelligence. From 1953 to 1956 he held positions as Deputy Chief and Vice Director of these counterintelligence branches and by February 8, 1957 he headed a branch of military intelligence...”
- (4) “He had access to a tremendous amount of intelligence information which included data on the operations of Soviet and satellite intelligence networks and agents, as well as their programs, methods of operation and traitors in the Western World who worked with them.”
- (5) “Having reached a high position and having accumulated much intelligence data, Aleksei made contact with the West. From April 1958 until December 1960 he voluntarily served the United States at great personal danger. He personally prepared 160 pages of typewritten secret reports and sent them through to the West. He also sent over 5000 pages of top secret documents on microfilm having to do with Soviet satellite espionage, Polish and East German intelligence services and agents in Western Europe and the U.S. Army---military, economic, political, intelligence and counterintelligence matters regarding the Soviet bloc. He also sent over 800 pages of Soviet and Polish intelligence reports which showed the results of their intelligence operations in the Free World, 80% of which were found to have come from secret Free World sources.”
- (6) “As a result of a particular discovery by the KGB, Aleksei and his wife were forced to flee to the West in January 1961. On January 12, 1961 they arrived in the U.S...accompanied by Homer E. Roman of the CIA. From this date until December 14, 1963...Aleksei was briefing U.S. authorities on the reports and microfilms already sent through. He also brought with him complete data on 240 persons, their names, identifications, assignments, locations, and operations.”
- (7) “Aleksei also worked with U.S. intelligence authorities here on over 2000 cases of new matters involving agents of Polish Military Intelligence, East German Secret Service, the KGB-GRU, etc.”
- (8) “As to how accurate Aleksei’s information was, there are the actual cases cited, plus statements made by U.S.officials in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee Hearing ‘State Department Security 1963-

1965'. We find on page 624 where Chief Counsel Mr. Sourwine is questioning John R. Norpel who had been in the FBI and State Department Security section:

'Mr. Sourwine: Do you know of any information ever furnished to the U.S. Government [by Goleniewski] which turned out to be untrue or inaccurate? Mr. Norpel: *I do not, no sir.*"

(9) "The *Washington Daily News* of January 19, 1965 published a UPI dispatch which stated...Herman Kimsey who was chief of analysis and research for CIA and more recently was Assistant Chief of Security for the Republican National Committee, said the agency has made exhaustive tests to establish the true identity of Col. Michael Goleniewski. He said he is convinced the tests proved the mysterious Pole is Grand Duke Alexei, only son of Czar Nicholas II..."

OK---fasten your seat belts!

In January 1975, Goleniewski (or Aleksei, if you prefer that version) began publishing a monthly newsletter called "*Double Eagle*" to present his views.

On March 19, 1985 Goleniewski wrote a 5-page document entitled "Selected Analysis of Dissemination of Soviet Disinformation Through Western Publications in Result of Arrangements, Participation and/or Nonfeasance on the Part of the United States Government."

A major portion of his 1985 document is devoted to none other than Anatoli Golitsyn.

On page 1, Goleniewski states that after Golitsyn's arrival into the U.S. in 1962, he (Goleniewski) was "consulted by CIA representative 'Herman' [Kimsey] with regard to this person and his activities. Consequently, I was debriefed about Golitsyn's past and (his) status in the structure of KGB..."

Goleniewski then expressed puzzlement about the "strong support and promotion" of Golitsyn within the U.S. government "and especially in British SIS" and, particularly, their "continuous tolerance of Golitsyn's disinformation" which, Goleniewski concluded, "is indicating that in his case are involved Soviet penetration in the United States and British Governments. His recent book [New Lies For Old] presenting a classic example of Soviet disinformation about the Communist Strategy of Deception and Disinformation, being written by a KGB officer who was Security Officer in the third grade Embassy in Helsinki, is elevating Golitsyn to a prominence and authority on matters he never understood and is not understanding."

Goleniewski then observed:

"It is a matter of great entertainment in various KGB and GRU schools in the Soviet Union and among some of the knowledgeable Chiefs of Western Security and Counter-Intelligence Agencies...that the U.S. government approved as true, publication of Golitsyn's disinformation concerning his past activities, in Soviet Union, where he claims at the age of 26-27 years, i.e. as maximum Lt. of the KGB ranks, that he was involved in drawing up a proposal to the Central Committee on the reorganization of Soviet intelligence."

"Golitsyn is misinforming, stating that in connection with this proposal, he attended meetings of the Central Committee Secretariat chaired by Stalin, and a meeting of the Presidium chaired by Malenkov and attended by Khrushchev, Brezhnev, and Bulganin. All these and many of other informations...are not based on facts...Generally, experts on Soviet disinformation in Western Europe are seeing in Golitsyn's book an evidence that the U.S. Intelligence and Security Agencies are run by ignorants engulfed by Soviet disinformation and idiocies of its individual promoters a la Golitsyn."

“In this light, it is important to study the attached report by (the) late real expert on Intelligence and Security matters, Edward Hunter, Publisher of *Tactics* magazine which was republished in The Eagle, Yakima WA on June 6, 1968 and titled ‘We Harrass Our Friends’ “

Note: I interrupt Goleniewski’s comments to point out that ---

(1) Edward Hunter is described by the Birch Society as another indisputable “**expert**” regarding “*disinformation*” campaigns and “*brainwashing*”.

In fact, the JBS sold all of Hunter’s publications and effusively praised and distributed his July 11, 1961 testimony before the Senate Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws entitled “*The New Drive Against The Anti-Communist Program*” AND

(2) *The Eagle* (Yakima WA) was published by JBS National Council member Floyd Paxton! AND

(3) Hunter was effusively praised by such prominent conservative anti-communists as Sen. Strom Thurmond, Fred Schwarz, George E. Sokolsky, Fred Utley and Cong. Walter Judd.

OK, back to Goleniewski.

He goes on to report that Hunter “in his article republished in *The Eagle*...after careful investigations based upon his own independent sources stated (that): ‘...Golitsyn has been converted into a sort of grab bag agent. The work of a number of different persons including that of Goleniewski-Romanoff is being listed under the cover name Martel (Golitsyn). This is part of the operation being undertaken against the invaluable contributor to our security from his high post at Warsaw, Romanoff.”

Now, for the Goleniewski bombshell!

He observes that prior to publication of his first book, Golitsyn had a “low profile” but for 2 or 3 years after publication of Golitsyn’s first book, “...some of Soviet agents and dupes, often masqueraded as ‘reporters’, ‘authors’ etc. began to elevate Golitsyn again to levels properly exposed by Edward Hunter in 1968. Said disinforming publicity had been given Golitsyn during the last few years especially on the part of Communist-infiltrated publications such as *American Opinion*, *Parademagazine*, etc.” [bold type is my emphasis. *American Opinion* was the official magazine of the John Birch Society (!) until 1985 when it was replaced by *The New American*.]

Goleniewski then observed that Golitsyn “could not produce any valid information” of counterintelligence “because the only ‘proof’ of his reliability had been fake-defectors who attacked Golitsyn in accordance with KGB instruction, in this way making his defection legend stronger...” and Goleniewski then cites a *London Sunday Times Review* article of March 18, 1985 as an example of something “printed by inspiration of Soviet agents in England.”

I shall close with a Goleniewski comment on page 13 of the September 1984 issue of his newsletter, *Double Eagle*, which accompanies a sketch of Golitsyn:

“Despite established facts of Golitsyn’s disinformation (fragments) in the past, he is supported in the U.S.A. by some governmental officials, and also by misleading reports in British and American press (as in a report of the *American Opinion* magazine of March 1984.”)

So, in summary, here we have an example of right-wing conspiracy proponents asking us to believe two mutually exclusive propositions, namely, that both Golitsyn and Goleniewski are reliable and authoritative experts on Soviet disinformation and intelligence operations **even though** Goleniewski states emphatically that Golitsyn **was not** a reliable source of data and, in fact, Goleniewski claimed that Golitsyn was a phony Soviet defector and disinformation agent! [Incidentally, J. Edgar Hoover also thought Golitsyn was a phony defector!]

Furthermore, Goleniewski describes the Birch Society magazine, *American Opinion*, as "**Communist infiltrated**" and he stated that it facilitated the circulation of Golitsyn's disinformation!

And to make all this even more absurd, prominent Birch Society officials, endorsers, and admirers (including such prominent JBS columnists such as former FBI Special Agent Dan Smoot and Frank Capell) are on record stating unequivocally that Goleniewski was a knowledgeable, reliable, and authoritative source of information!

For additional substantiation, see FBI headquarters file 65-65192 on Michal Goleniewski. Questions or comments may be directed to me at: ernie1241@aol.com

Now, let's turn our attention to information in FBI files which contradicts Golitsyn's assertions.

The position of Anatoliy Golitsyn on the Sino-Soviet split was stated clearly as follows:

"The intimacy of the intelligence and security connection between the Soviets and Chinese up to the end of 1961 was incompatible with a serious deterioration in their overall relations before that date. The discrepancies between the evidence of a split and the open and inside information on continuing good relations must be viewed against the past history of intimate collaboration between the Soviet and Chinese parties in disinformation operations in 1944-1949, which effectively concealed the extent of Soviet aid to the Chinese Party in the final years of the civil war and successfully misrepresented Chinese-Communism as a relatively harmless agrarian reform movement."

Against this background, the fact that Sino-Soviet relations in 1959-1961 closely followed the pattern of Soviet-Yugoslav and Soviet-Albanian relations in the same period -- a period in which the grounds for tension and splits between the members of the bloc had been removed and all members, including the Chinese, contributed to the formulation of the new policy --- suggests that the Sino-Soviet split was, like the others, the product of bloc disinformation." ... [bold is my emphasis; New Lies For Old: The Communist Strategy of Deception and Disinformation, 2nd edition, Clarion House, 1990, pages 161-162].

By contrast, please consider the following relevant data:

According to the FBI, the most important U.S. "moles" inside the Communist Party--USA (CPUSA) were Morris Childs (Chicago) and his brother Jack Childs (New York City).

Morris, who was a senior CPUSA official, was our single most important source of data about secret CPUSA meetings. The FBI code names for Morris and Jack were CG 5824-S* and NY 694-S* respectively.

For those individuals who are unfamiliar with Morris Childs, I copy below a brief summary about him and underneath the summary I post the following additional data:

(1) excerpts from an FBI report about Childs and Operation Solo and

(2) excerpts from an FBI memo concerning the attendance by Morris at meetings in the Soviet Union which dealt with the Sino-Soviet split.

(3) excerpts from FBI memos pertaining to closed secret meetings of CPUSA

CNN SUMMARY RE: MORRIS CHILDS:

<http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/experience/spies/spy.files/infiltration/solo.html>

OPERATION SOLO

"Few people have heard of Morris Childs or "Operation Solo." But "Solo" -- in which Childs infiltrated the Communist Party of the United States and through it the international communist hierarchy -- was one of the greatest intelligence coups in U.S. Cold War history.

Childs, a communist in his youth, traveled to Moscow in 1929 to study revolutionary tactics at the Lenin School, where his classmates included future Eastern bloc leaders Walter Ulbricht (East Germany) and Josip Tito (Yugoslavia). When he returned home, he became a leader of the Communist Party of the United States in Wisconsin, then Chicago. He was a rising red star.

But in a return trip to Moscow in 1947 he became disillusioned, finding the Soviet Union in the throes of Stalinist repression, corruption and anti-Semitism. Upon returning home, he inwardly rejected the cause and volunteered his services to the FBI.

Childs became a key mole inside CPUSA, informing on American communists and their contacts with Moscow. Childs himself made 52 trips to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to meet with Leonid Brezhnev, Yuri Andropov and other top Soviet leaders.

For more than 30 years, he and his brother Jack provided the FBI with detailed and valuable information on Soviet affairs, including crucial perspective on the Sino-Soviet split and inside information on Soviet attitudes toward U.S. Cold War policy. His story largely unknown, Childs died in 1991 at the age of 89.

(1) FBI HQ file 67-268746, serial #223 is a 2/17/61 report on "SOLO"

(pg 1): "Solo Mission Number 8 was an unusual and outstanding success. CG 5824-S* was in Moscow, Russia, for almost three months during which time he surreptitiously obtained an extremely valuable, highly secret document issued by the Soviet Union dated 11-5-60 which sets out point-by-point the deep-seated ideological differences existing between Russia and Red China. Previously unknown conflicts on matters of state between Red China and Russia are also contained in this document. The Secretary of State and the Director of the CIA, in a total of four recent letters to the Director, have praised highly the valuable intelligence information developed by our informant on this mission."

"CG 5824-S* as a representative of the CPUSA, attended secret meetings convened in the Kremlin by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) along with representatives of all communist parties of the world. The proceedings at these meetings in plotting world domination were covered completely by our informant. As a result, we possess voluminous detailed accounts of daily occurrences for the three months these meetings were held. Other unusual accomplishments of this mission include: private remarks of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev on 10-22 and 12-4-60; consultations with top Soviet officials which determined that Soviet troops were used to drive Chinese communists from Russian territory; and the discovery of the existence of an international cadre training school currently being held in Moscow."

"The Solo operation has provided the U.S. Government with extensive valuable detailed intelligence information and our ability to expeditiously disseminate information of this type to high-level Government officials keeps the Bureau in the forefront as the outstanding intelligence agency in the world."

Pg 6: "Solo Mission 8 was unusual and most outstanding in successful achievement. CG 5824-S departed for Moscow on 9-22-60 with credentials issued by Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA delegation to the November meeting of communist parties in Moscow. He returned to the U.S. on 12-17-60. The November meeting was preceded by a four-week meeting of an Editorial Commission of representatives of 26 communist and workers' parties and during this meeting the informant was the keeper of the records. Through planning, it was possible for the informant to prepare for this trip by inserting secret pockets in his clothing. This later proved of great assistance when the informant was successful in surreptitiously obtaining a 121-page secret document issued by the Soviet Union dated 11-5-60. This document sets out point-by-point the deep-seated ideological differences existing between the Soviet Union and Communist China. It also contains extensive information on previously unknown conflicts regarding matters of state between Red China and Russia..."*

Pg 7: "It is believed that this memorandum is the only one in existence in the U.S. on this highly important subject matter. Among the other items of valuable information obtained on this trip were the following:

- 1. List of names and positions of representatives of 26 communist parties of the world represented at the October 1960 meeting and a list of the names and positions of representatives of the 81 communist parties at the November 1960 meeting. In most cases the informant met with heads of delegations at these conferences and discussed matters of interest in the intelligence field.*
- 2. Furnished details of 21 out of 78 speeches which were made during the three-month period.*
- 3. Furnished the essence of remarks made by Nikita Khrushchev on 10-22-60 and remarks made on another occasion on 12-4-60.*
- 4. Furnished details of an extremely important five-day meeting in Moscow of leaders of the communist parties of Latin American countries dealing with such items as assistance to Cuba in the case of invasion of Cuba by the United States.*
- 5. Furnished results of contacts in Moscow with representatives from nearly all the trouble spots in the world, including China, Cuba, West Berlin, Korea, Japan and India.*
- 6. Obtained information concerning the existence of an international cadre training school currently being held in Moscow.*
- 7. Through personal consultations with top Soviet officials, determined that Soviet troops were used to drive Chinese communists from Russian territory sometime prior to August 1960.*
- 8. Furnished details concerning arrangements of financial support by the CPSU for the CPUSA.*
- 9. Arranged future meetings with (name deleted) Soviet Delegation to the UN in the U.S. for the purpose of passage of information and transmittal of Soviet funds to the CPUSA. On 2-12-61, \$88,000 was passed to the CPUSA by (name deleted) as a result of this arrangement.*

(2) FBI HQ file 100-428091, serial #1023 (12/18/60 airtel from SAC New York to J. Edgar Hoover re: "Solo")]

"CG 5824-S [hereinafter Morris] participated in two four-week meetings which dealt with the ideological dispute between the Communist Party of China (CPC) and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Morris also participated in a five-day conference of Latin American Communist Parties. In addition, there were caucuses with leaders of various Communist Parties. As a result of all of these meetings, Morris has voluminous detailed notes which he estimates will take days, if not weeks, to completely exhaust..."*

"Morris has translated from the Russian a list which contains the names of most of the delegates to both of the four-week meetings. Except for some participation by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, Morris was the only CPUSA representative at the four-week meeting of the Editorial Committee."

"Morris made extensive handwritten notes from a 121-page letter from the Central Committee of the CPUS and dated 11/5/60. According to Morris, this letter presents practically the entire story of the dispute between the CPC and CPSU. Morris also has copies of the documents issued as a result of the meetings in Moscow. These documents have been Photostatted and are being transmitted to the Bureau by separate communications..."

Observations and Comments on the Ideological Dispute Between CPSU and the CPC

"Only two or three days before the conclusion of the second four-week meeting in Moscow it appeared that the CPSU and the CPC would not reach any agreement. The CPC was surprised by the fact that it received little support for its viewpoint. On the Communist Party of Albania gave the CPC solid support at all times. Not one Communist Party in the Western Hemisphere or in Africa supported the viewpoint of the CPC. The CPC received support of the CP's of Thailand and Malaya on the need for militant or non-peaceful revolutions. The Communist Parties of North Korea, Japan, Vietnam and Australia supported the CPC to the extent that they argued for softer language in certain sections of the Declaration or Statement of the meeting of representatives of the Communist and Worker Parties. The Communist Parties of India and Ceylon supported the viewpoint of the CPSU."

"Agreement was finally reached by giving concessions to the CP of China. Not to have given concessions would have meant an irrevocable split between the CP of China and the CPSU. The position of the CPC was that there has been a vacuum since the death of V.I. Lenin. The CPC wanted to revive Stalinism as a step toward making Mao Tse Tung the leader of international Communism. The Chinese have a long-term perspective and will try to win the CP's in the international Communist movement to their side with Mao Tse Tung as the leader. The Chinese are tough negotiators and wear everyone down in the debates. They may wear everyone down in the future but at these two meetings, each of four weeks duration, they were shocked because they did not get more support for their viewpoints. On the other hand, the CPSU now realizes that it has to pay more attention to the fraternal Communist Parties and have better relationships with them."

"Ideological concessions were made to the CPC in order to present to the world a show of unity and to provide a truce with the aim of ironing out the remaining differences in the future in one form or another. Ideological concessions made to the CPC were:

- (1) Cutting down the section of the Declaration or Statement which dealt with Stalin's cult of the personality.*
- (2) Leaving out a statement to the effect that the 21st Congress of the CPSU had world-wide significance.*
- (3) Minimizing the main theoretical propositions resulting from the 20th Congress of the CPSU. These propositions were:*
 - a. That there is no fatal inevitability of war and*
 - b. That revolutions do not always have to use force and violence; that peaceful revolutions become more and more possible as socialism advances in the world*
- (4) Sharpening the attack on the Yugoslav revolutionists. In this regard the CPSU and CP's in Western Europe wanted to compromise their differences with the League of Yugoslav Communists but the CP of China would not agree to this.*
- (5) Omitting from the Statement or Declaration a definition of national Communism. The definition was intended to apply to the situation in Yugoslavia. The representatives of the CPC stated that the term, national Communism, was created by the bourgeoisie and it is really aimed at the CPC. The CPC was willing to have the Declaration deal with bourgeois nationalism but not with national Communism.*

(6) A change in regard to the question of factionalism and groupings in the international Communist movement. The original draft of the Declaration cited the need for strict adherence to international decisions arrived at in conference of the international Communist movement. In the final Statement, there is no condemnation of factionalism and in its stead there is an appeal for unity in the international Communist movement.

(7) In various parts of the Declaration there was a sharpening of the language. The term United States imperialism was added in several places as a result of Chinese pressure."

"Morris advised that Teng Hsiao ping, General Secretary of the CPC, was the main spokesman for the CPC at the two four-week meetings in Moscow. Liu Shao Chi, Chairman of the Chinese People's Republic, did not speak at the Communist and Workers Parties held in November and December." ...

"In the opinion of Morris and others who attended the meetings in Moscow, the Chinese will, in the future, demand more material concessions from the Russians. The unknown factor at this time is the reaction of Mao Tse tung to the Statement issued in Moscow at the conclusion of the meeting. The Chinese gloat over every setback to Soviet foreign policy. Future events in Asia and Africa may strengthen the hand of the Chinese in their dealings with the Russians. The Russians will wait to see what the Chinese do and in the meantime will emphasize the need for unity in the international Communist movement."

(3) CLOSED SECRET MEETINGS OF CPUSA

Chicago 100-40624, #12, 7/30/63 Chicago report

Pg 1: "A source, who has furnished reliable information in the past, advised on July 27, 1963 that a meeting of Communist Party (CP) actives, that is, so-called active members of the CP, was held on July 27, 1963 at [location excised], Chicago, Illinois. The purpose of this meeting was to hear a lecture by Gus Hall, General Secretary of the CPUSA. About fifty people were in attendance, including the key leadership of the CP of Illinois, the leadership from the CP of Wisconsin, the CP of Michigan and the CP of Minnesota."

Pg 3: "Hall said that the Party also had the position that the Kennedy Administration was a capitalist, imperialist administration but that it could be influenced in a positive direction...Concerning the Chinese-Soviet rift, Hall said there is a special supplement in circulation which presents the Soviet Union's answer to the Chinese statement last July. However, Hall indicated he feels that the movement will be unified. The question is when and how much damage will be created before the international communist movement takes place. Secondly, Hall stated that socialism will continue to be built in all socialist countries. The Chinese Party is out to split the Marxist movement. Thus far the Chinese have been defeated in their efforts."

Pg 4: Hall "said that the policy of attempting to skip stages in the revolution from feudal capitalism to communes had been disastrous in China and Albania. He stated that these 'renegade Parties' were also guilty of failing to recognize errors of tactics, saying that failure to do so was of great detriment."

Pg 5: "Hall reportedly related that he was extremely dissatisfied with the reaction which he had received from the comrades attending the meeting. Hall...stated that the group as a whole was an 'all talk-do nothing' group of people and that he was very pessimistic, particularly since he had opened the meeting for questions concerning the Chinese-Soviet rift and there had been very few questions propounded on this subject. Hall stated that he knows there are pro-Chinese individuals and groupings within the Party in Illinois and he had hoped to get some discussion going on this subject matter in order to further expand on his remarks concerning the Chinese-Soviet rift and the split in the international Communist movement."

Chicago 100-40624, #53, 8/27/63 Special Agent report to Special Agent in Charge

Refers to informant oral summary of August 1963 meeting in Chicago of CP members where Gus Hall delivered "a report to Illinois Party members on major political and ideological problems facing the Party."

Pg. 6: "Hall next spoke on the Chinese-Soviet split and factionalism in general. Hall said that the American Party has more 'left sects' than any other in the world. He noted that groups have been expelled from the Party, they have formed

many organizations and from these groups sometimes as many as three or four splinter groups have been formed, all fighting the Party and each other."

Pg 8: ... "He stated the Chinese were the first to publicize differences between themselves and the Soviets, and they broke the agreement to stop public discussions of differences. He also said that every group which has been expelled from the Party here or anywhere else in the world is today taking the side of China in the dispute. Even the 'National Guardian' has slandered CPSU and they print articles in the Chinese Party press. He said the Chinese press prints every little article published by the left radical 'crackpots'"

Pg 11: "Another question was why does China take such a strong position against Tito. Hall said he could not understand this situation. He noted that Tito and China have made the same mistakes. Tito covered his mistakes with revisionism and China is trying to cover its mistakes with dogmatism."

San Francisco 100-10511, serial #225 is a 2/27/61 FBI Special Agent report to SAC-San Francisco regarding meeting of San Francisco County Communist Party Committee at which Mickey Lima [Chairman, Northern California District of Communist Party] was the featured speaker, on the December 1960 meeting of Communist Party delegates in Moscow

Pg 2: "There are communist parties in 87 countries of the world. 81 of these were represented at this meeting...We all know that the Chinese Party had taken a different ideological position in recent years from the Soviet Party. The Chinese Party has taken the position that war is inevitable and that socialism can only be achieved in violent revolution. The Party of the Soviet Union has said that war is not inevitable due to the present day strength of the socialist world and the peace forces in all countries. It has also said that a peaceful transition to socialism is possible for the same reasons...In fact, in the past year this ideological split has

Pg 3: resulted in difficulties particularly in international organizations such as the international peace movement, the World Federation of Trade Unions, and in an international women's organization."

MORE INFO REGARDING MY RESEARCH: <http://ernie1241.googlepages.com/home>